THEOLOGY

VOL. LI SEPTEMBER, 1948 No. 339

Editorial Notes

WE hope next month to be in a position to comment on the Report of the Lambeth Conference. This number, on account of the holidays of the printers, not to mention that of the editor, has to go to press preternaturally early. We must limit ourselves to some notes on recent publications.

* * * * *

The Genius of the Church of England, by the Bishop of Derby and Canon Charles Smyth (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), contains two lectures that were given at a school for the clergy of the Northern Province in 1945. The Bishop of Derby's lecture on "Theology in the Church of England" has a special interest for readers of THEOLOGY, since he takes up points that were raised in a correspondence on the subject in this review some years ago. It may be added that in the course of doing so he inadvertently confers a canonry on our esteemed contributor, the Rev. J. H. Jacques.

Canon Smyth's lecture on "The Church of England in History and To-day" might be described as a *hors-d'œuvre* for the student of ecclesiastical history. It is of a most appetizing kind, and it is accompanied by a veritable feast of footnotes. Albert Schweitzer has said that theologians usually express their real opinions in footnotes and introduce their most cherished convictions with "perhaps." Canon Smyth does not keep his real opinions out of the text, but you will miss some of his most important and provoking observations if you do not read his footnotes. Though we should ourselves have been inclined to insert a "perhaps" rather more often, we are glad that he has not done so. The footnotes also contain some memorable and unfamiliar quotations, and many references that one would like to follow up—*e.g.* the title of the Bampton Lectures for 1855, *The Absence of Precision in the Formularies of the Church of England, Scriptural, and Suitable to a State of Probation.*

* * * * *

We cordially welcome the *Scottish Journal of Theology* (Oliver and Boyd, 3s. 6d. quarterly), which looks as though it will materially strengthen the slender array of British theological periodicals. The first number certainly provides both solid and appetizing fare. The contributors include the Rev. J. K. S. Reid, Prof. D. M. Mackinnon, Prof. G. Johnston, the Rev. T. F. Torrance, Prof. J. G. Riddell, Bishop Stephen Neill and Prof. John Baillie. Only the first part of three articles appears in this number; we hope so considerable a dividing of articles will not be a regular feature, which in the case of a quarterly has grave disadvantages.

* * * * *

The Unpublished Diary of Pierre Laval (Falcon Press, 12s. 6d.) is miscalled a diary. It contains notes written by Laval during his imprisonment, in order to prepare for his defence, together with supporting documents. Laval was not a great statesman, but he was a courageous patriot who had exceedingly adverse conditions with which to deal. He has been greatly maligned, and was at last treated abominably. He has been vilified by multitudes, not only of Frenchmen, and not only of political innocents. Justice requires that his defence should be heard.

* * * * *

New editions of three well-known books have appeared. (1) *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, edited with notes and twenty-four studies by Stephen Hobhouse (Rockcliff, 25s.). The first edition was reviewed by Evelyn Underhill in the February, 1939, issue of THEOLOGY. Mr Aldous Huxley has written a foreword to the new edition, and Mr Hobhouse has added some further notes and an appendix concerning the influence of Jacob Boehme on Sir Isaac Newton. (2) *Religion in the Victorian Era*, by L. E. Elliott-Binns (Lutterworth Press, 21s.). This is a second edition of a book that was first published in 1936. It has been but little revised. "The present Archbishop of Canterbury" is cited as an outstanding example of the Scotchmen who came south to find their place in the ranks of the ministry. But it is a very useful book, as good an introduction to the ecclesiastical history of the period as we are likely to get for some time to come. It covers the whole field in a remarkably impartial manner, and the author's acquaintance with the biographical literature of the nineteenth century enables him constantly to introduce happy illustrations. (3) *What is Christian Civilization?* by John Baillie (Christophers, 5s.). This book, on its first appearance, was reviewed in THEOLOGY, February, 1946. To the present edition Dr Baillie has added an appendix on "Kierkegaard, Barth and Brunner on the Practice of Baptism." It is a succinct account of what these three theologians teach about baptism, and it calls attention to aspects of the subject which are ignored in some contemporary discussions.

* * * * *

The *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (June, 1948) notices a booklet by J. Denis entitled *L'administration du baptême aux enfants des catholiques non pratiquants* (Paris, 1947), and quotes the author as reaching the following conclusion: "Si, au temps du baptême, les circonstances montrent que la probabilité de le voir plus tard fréquenter le catéchisme et faire sa première communion est nulle ou quasi nulle, l'enfant, semble-t-il, ne doit pas être admis à le recevoir." The same issue contains the text of the letter of the Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission to Cardinal Suhard, which appears to allow Roman Catholic scholars considerably more freedom in the critical study of the Pentateuch.

* * * * *

Finally, we call attention to a first novel of unusual promise and insight—*Portrait in Two Colours*, by Stuart B. Jackman (Faber, 8s. 6d.).

St Paul's Defence of His Apostolate

WHAT is an Apostle, and what is an Apostolic Minister? Christendom is divided: the Catholic side of it stresses the office and its necessary place within the divinely ordered economy of the Israel of God, while the Protestant side lays the emphasis on the witness borne by the minister to divine truth. This division of view lies behind the controverted issues of the apostolic succession, validity, and intercommunion. Yet the truth as it is in Christ is one; and there is no self-evident incompatibility between a belief that there must be a theological principle behind Church order, and a jealous insistence on the truth of our Justification through faith and the principle that the hierarchy must not be regarded as acting vicariously on behalf of an absent Christ, but ministerially in the name of a living and reigning Christ.

This paper has been written in the hope of clearing up the approach to these issues by an examination of the way in which St Paul defended his Apostolate in the so-called Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The problem which he had to meet was this: How is it possible for a man, entrusted with a divine office, to vindicate and defend that office without falsifying it by his very defence of it? How is it humanly possible that the defence of it should not drop into a tacit assumption that it is a human office? This is bound to happen when the defence is conducted *κατὰ σάρκα*, *i.e.* on the ordinary human level. But the problem cannot be solved by abandoning the claim that he has a divine office; for he has an Apostolate, and must insist that it is a valid Apostolate. That is what makes the "tension." He must uphold his office, yet not as *his* but as Christ's. Let us see how this works out.

I. No document can be properly understood without a just estimate of the actual circumstances in which it was written. I cannot, for lack of space, provide an adequate discussion of the various theories concerning the problem of 2 Corinthians. I shall therefore beg leave to assume the truth of one theory and test it by its power to explain St Paul's words: the theory, namely, that the main part of the "Painful Letter" referred to in ii, 3, 4, 9 and vii, 8 is preserved in chs. x-xiii; these chapters were therefore written some months earlier than i-ix. I assume also that, as all seem to agree, vi, 14-vii, 1 are an intruded fragment, perhaps from his first letter of all, alluded to in 1 Cor. v, 9.

St Paul wrote 1 Corinthians from Ephesus, and it was ill received. He paid a visit to Corinth (2 Cor. xiii, 2), which appears to have been a painful failure (ii, 1). Already he had been having a bad time at Ephesus, having "fought with wild beasts" (1 Cor. xv, 32); after his return the persecution became intensified, and, as several passages in 2 Corinthians show, he fully expected martyrdom, and Prisca and Aquila risked their lives to save his (Rom. xvi, 4). It was in the midst of these outward conflicts that he had his trouble with the Corinthians (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi, 28).

After his return from the Painful Visit he wrote the Painful Letter. From it we can gather what the ringleader (the *τις* of ii, 5—let us

call him X) had been saying about him. "X says that when I am at Corinth I am humble, but while absent I am brave and assert myself (x, 1); my letters are powerful, but my presence is weak and my speech contemptible (x, 10). He criticizes my bad grammar (xi, 6). He, of course, is fully assured that he is Christ's (x, 7), and he thinks me a simpleton (xi, 7*ff.*) for not demanding of you my maintenance. I am something of a fool (xi, 16), whereas he is very sure of himself, dominates you, bullies you (xi, 20), and even suggests that my refusal to accept maintenance was a trick to get you in my power (xii, 16)."

X was a particularly nasty piece of goods; and the problem was, what line could St Paul possibly take with such a man without putting himself in the wrong? Should he confront him in open battle, and bear him down and defeat him by the sheer weight of his personality? But then the victory, if victory there were, would be the victory of Paul the controversialist, not of the Apostle of Christ. The conflict would have been waged "according to the flesh" (*κατὰ σάρκα*, x, 2*f.*); this phrase gives the key to the problem before him. Somehow he must awaken in the Corinthians some sense of the right proportion of things. On the one hand, he must not act *κατὰ σάρκα* (x, 3-5); on the other, his apostolic authority "which the Lord has given him, for building up and not for casting down," must be vindicated (xi, 8; *cf.* xiii, 10), and the Corinthians must return to their obedience (x, 6). For the Master's sake, and for the salvation of their souls (xi, 3), they must receive the Master's Apostle (*cf.* ii, 9).

But how can the Apostle bring them to this without magnifying himself instead of the Master? Shall he brag? Others are bragging *κατὰ σάρκα*; well, then, he will brag too (xi, 18). Shall he brag of his Hebrew blood, his rabbinic doctorate, his Apostolate? (22-3). Yet it sounds rather unreal to do this, when at Ephesus he has his back to the wall and expects to lose his life any day; he is not an Apostle of Christ in the flush of a successful missionary career, but an Apostle threatened with the failure of his work and with sudden death. To this his Apostolate has led him. Well, then, of this he will "brag": not of his strength, but of his weakness and the failure of his strength; of shipwreck, robbery, toils of travel, hunger, imprisonment, together with the anxiety over all the churches (Corinth included), and, most undignified of all, the occasion when he was lowered over the wall of Damascus in a clothes basket (xi, 23-33). To brag of these is somewhat grim; should he rather brag, as well he might, of visions and revelations from the Lord? But precisely in connexion with those experiences God had taught him a lesson, through a painful and humiliating bodily ailment, that it is through human weakness that divine strength is made perfect (xii, 1-10).

But, he protests, it is they who have forced him into a false position in compelling him thus to assert himself and vindicate that apostolic authority, equal to that of the very chiefest Apostles, which they ought to have acknowledged (11). It will be terrible indeed if his forthcoming visit to Corinth has to be another "painful visit" (20-21). It may have to be so: a formal hearing, with minutes duly taken (xiii, 1-2); a trial of strength, whether the Corinthians will obey the Christ whose

victory was won through weakness (3-4). May God grant that they make the right choice; yes, even if that were to involve the Apostle's personal humiliation instead of his vindication (5-7). At all costs it must not be the victory of Paul the controversialist. Yet he has his apostolic authority, and must call for obedience to it, for the Lord has given it to him; but it is for building up and not for casting down (10).

II. He tells us that he sent the letter "out of much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears" (ii, 4), dreading lest it should have been a mistake to have sent it at all. Titus went with the letter; meanwhile the persecution reached its climax (clearly far worse than we should gather from Acts xix), and Paul escaped unexpectedly with his life. He did not go to Corinth, for reasons which he explained to them later (i, 15-ii, 9), but to Troas. There a splendid evangelistic opportunity presented itself, but he could not settle down to work for anxiety about his beloved but erring Corinthians (ii, 12-13). He went on to Macedonia, and still could not settle down (vii, 5); but suddenly (O joy!) Titus appeared with the news that at Corinth all was well, and the Corinthians had made a wonderful repentance, which St Paul describes in terms that have become classical (vii, 9-11). They had censured X so severely that St Paul fears that it may be more than he can bear, and begs them to make clear that the affair is to end in complete forgiveness, both theirs and his own in the Lord's name (ii, 7-10; this is an apostolic absolution, verse 10). We may note in passing that the result of all this will have been that the First Epistle received at Corinth the status of (almost) canonical scripture; here we have the explanation of the fact that Clement of Rome, forty years later, speaks of one Pauline Epistle only (chap. xlvii), and perhaps some important light on the process by which the Epistles became canonical.

So he writes 2 Cor. i-ix. The last two chapters need not concern us; they are occupied with the great Collection, which Titus on a previous visit had done much to work up. While Timothy seems to have been loyal but somewhat timid and nervous (1 Cor. iv, 17; xvi, 10-11), Titus must have had some real greatness about him, since he not only succeeded in making the Corinthians see their duty to St Paul, but had before this discerned the importance of the Collection as setting the seal on St Paul's life work and securing the unity of Jew and Gentile in the Church (*cf.* 2 Cor. ix, 12-15 with Rom. xv, 26-7, 30-2).

He begins, of course (2 Cor. i, 3), with thanksgiving for the comfort he has received in the midst of tribulation, for he has suffered much (5-7), and indeed never expected to survive the persecution (8-11). He then declares that, as they have now acknowledged, his behaviour to them has throughout been sincere and disinterested (12-14). Nor must they be surprised that he had gone back on the intention, emphatically asserted in the Painful Letter (xii, 14; xiii, 1), of coming direct to Corinth. He explains that it was not fickleness (i, 17), but rather such faithfulness as is demanded of the servant of the faithful Lord (18-22); he wanted to spare them (23), fearing that a personal encounter might lead to an effort to dominate them (24), and so to

another painful visit (ii, 1). Therefore he had written instead (3, 4, 9). Instead of going to Corinth, he had gone to Troas and on to Macedonia; and, in spite of his failure to do much work in these places, he speaks of his journey as a triumphal progress (ii, 14), the triumphing conqueror being Christ, while Paul is one of the prisoners following in His train, happy because, though he himself is limping along, the flags are out and the people are cheering. For such is his Apostolate; he is not a pedlar, hawking round religion at bargain prices to anyone who will buy (17), but he is speaking the truth as in God's sight.

Is he now "commending himself" or seeking a "letter of commendation"? We can infer, from the frequent occurrence of this phrase, that X has made great play with it (in the Painful Letter, x, 12, 18; xii, 11: in this, iii, 1; iv, 2; v, 12; vi, 4; vii, 11). But no, the Corinthians themselves are his letter of commendation; it is written in their hearts (iii, 2-3), and therein is fulfilled Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant which takes the place of the Old Covenant, written for Moses on the tables of stone. The Mosaic Law, to be observed in the letter, led to death; the Messianic Spirit gives life (6). Moses' face shone as he beheld the Glory, and he had to cover his face with a veil; but with the New Covenant there is a greater Glory shining not on the face of one saint only but on us all, so that, as between the Lord and one another, we need no veil but can use complete freedom and openness of speech (*παρρησία*, iii, 12-iv, 2). This openness is made impossible where there is unbelief (iii, 14-15; iv, 3-4); but it exists where there is the apostolic preaching of Jesus Christ as Lord, and its responsive acceptance.

And yet, since in the Lord's Apostles divine strength is made perfect through human weakness, the treasure is in earthen vessels, which are liable to be broken to pieces at any time, as in the late persecution (7-11); but since the frail vessel contains divine power, the Lord's servant knows that though distressed he is not cast down, though pursued he is not forsaken (8-9). There is further the sure hope that when at last the vessel is broken to pieces it is that the Lord may re-make it in the resurrection of the body (iv, 13-v, 5). Such were his meditations during the persecution at Ephesus; there were further thoughts about presence here in the body, involving an absence from the Lord, and about His judgment-seat before which we must all stand (6-10).

Such, then, is our Apostolate (11); it involves most truly a participation in our Lord's passion (iv, 10-11); it has to be grounded in fear of the Lord, and it necessitates entire "openness" (v, 11); for it demands on the part of all, both minister and people, to have died and to be risen with Christ (14-15), and to abandon wholly the way of living and thinking which is "according to the flesh" (16), for now the prophetic promise of the New Creation has been fulfilled (17; *cf.* Isa. lxv, 17). Hence the Gospel message that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself (v, 19); this message is committed to the Apostolate, so that the Apostle is a *shaliach* or ambassador in God's name to men (20).

Thus it is as fellow-workers for God that the Apostles come (vi, 1)

Now it becomes clear why the Painful Letter had to take the form it did, and it was necessary to "brag" of his weakness. Let him, then, repeat (vi, 4-10) what he wrote then (xi, 23-7); for it is the very condition of the apostolic ministry to be "dying, and behold we live; chastened, and not killed; suffering, yet alway rejoicing."

"So, my dear Corinthians, I have kept nothing back from you, but have told you all that is in my heart (11-12); will you make a like response, and confess that I did not wrong you or take any advantage of you (vi, 13, vii, 2)? I know that it is so, for (to resume where I broke off five chapters back) Titus has told me all about the fear and trembling with which you received him, and the joy that he had with you (vii, 13-15). I rejoice, then, that I feel confident that all is well" (16).

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

The Assumption of the Virgin and Papal Infallibility

Nearly eighty years have passed since the Vatican Council established Papal Infallibility as a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church. The excitement of that occasion has long since died away, and the doctrine has become an accepted piece of furniture in the ecclesiastical world. But this is not wholly due to the appeasing influence of time. It is also due to the fact that since 1870 there has been no clear instance of a Pope invoking the infallible powers accorded to him. The opposition at the Vatican Council comprehended a wide variety of scepticism and mistrust, but was somewhat united by the fear that Pius IX and his advisors would immediately make *de fide* certain curious and infirm opinions which they held, in particular those which had recently found expression in the Syllabus of Errors. Such fears were most agreeably unfulfilled. The guarded terms in which the infallible function of the Papacy was defined seemed, to a later observation, almost a victory for the moderates, while the lengthening lull in the matter of new definitions made it appear that, far from inaugurating a revolution in doctrine, the decision of 1870 was a definition to end definitions. So long after that dramatic year of modern Church history it is a little strange and disturbing to hear that the lull is coming to an end, and that the present Pope intends shortly to resume the exercise of his most peculiar function. Yet it is so. During the past year or two the Pope has been receiving petitions from bodies of Catholics in many countries (including England). These petitions, genuine enough but engineered locally with encouragement from Rome, have asked that the Pope would declare infallibly that the Assumption of the Virgin Mary is a fact of history, and that it ranks among the truths of faith committed to the Apostles. Such a declaration would make belief in the Assumption obligatory for every Roman Catholic and threaten with excommunication any who wished to make reservations on the point. More ominous still, Pius XII has publicly and benevolently referred to these petitions, and a Catholic

newspaper (no doubt well advised) has announced that 1950, which will be a Holy Year in Rome, is the probable time when the definition will be made.

Of a Church Council to deliberate the matter there has been no rumour, and at present it seems unlikely that such opposition as was raised in 1870 will in 1950 need first to be overcome. From the point of view of the average Roman Catholic, a definition of the Assumption would merely confirm what he has always been taught and has never known any reason to disbelieve. The doctrine of the Assumption has behind it a tradition of more than thirteen centuries, the feast associated with it being a most venerable thing and a day when Roman Catholics are bound to attend mass. It is taught in Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism, issued from Rome with very high authority.[1] A predecessor of Pius XII has made opposition particularly difficult by declaring that to doubt the Assumption of the Virgin would be "impious and blasphemous." The belief has so far grown into Catholic theology that it would now be infinitely simpler to raise it to the level of dogma than to excise it as a pious rumour. Whether or not the definition can be stopped, the Assumption has its assured place in the Roman Catholic scheme, and the faithful could be shocked by its abandonment but not surprised by its vindication.

It may then naturally be asked, why is a definition of the Assumption necessary? Hitherto a definition has been occasioned by some need to clarify a matter of faith or morals which has been brought into dispute. Here there is no existing dispute either inside the Roman Catholic Church or outside, for inside there is unanimity and outside there is apathy. The reason given for defining the Assumption is one which must seem remarkable to those not accustomed to finding novelties in the procedure of Rome. It is simply being done "to give honour to Mary." Rather than a serious judgment on a delicate matter of theology and history, the proposed definition is conceived as an act of devotion countering the infidelity and materialism of the age. The motive, if a novel one, is laudable enough, but it may be questioned whether the best way to avoid one extreme is to rush to the other, whether the best way to combat apostasy is to give full rein to a freakish piety.

Certainly the definition will fail to help the cause of Christendom. If it has any effect upon atheistic materialists, the effect will be to harden them. If the Man on the Cross signifies nothing to them, the Assumption of His mother cannot mean more. On the other hand, the definition, which is bound to be entirely unacceptable to the Protestant Churches, will leave the army of Christianity even more fatally disunited than it is now. Pius IX's two dogmas, the Immaculate Conception (1854) and Papal Infallibility (1870), have proved ruinous to all the effort and aspiration of the twentieth century towards the reunion of the Christian Churches. He dug a trench between

[1] However, not all Catholic manuals support Gasparri. *The Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, used in this country, does not mention the Assumption. Neither does Cardinal Gibbons' widely read *Faith of our Fathers*.

Catholicism and Protestantism at the very moment when the healing process might have begun. Reunion seems to be a lost cause, though the very perseverance of its sentiment seems to promise some ultimate achievement. Yet the Roman authorities are so insensitive to the desire for reconciliation, or else so blind to the realities which torture that desire, that they are prepared to add another doctrinal difference to the list accumulated, one which will add centuries to the long tale of Christian schism. On this ground alone one would expect a little discreet hesitation, or some cry of "Inopportune!" somewhere raised.

The most serious objection to the proposed dogma is that it is doubtful whether the Assumption of the Virgin ever occurred. The next most serious objection is, whether it occurred or not, it was almost certainly not an article of faith to the Apostles, nor was it so regarded by any believers until very recent times.

The Roman Catholic Church does not regard itself as bound by scriptural references in making its profession of faith, yet in fact a text can be found to provide support to each one of its tenets. Even the Immaculate Conception, rejected by medieval theologians, finds its scriptural anchor in the angelic salutation to the Virgin, "Hail, Mary, full of grace," such fullness being possible only to one conceived without sin. The Assumption, however, if made a dogma, will be unique in having not the most tenuous connexion with scripture. Yet there was ample occasion for Luke or Paul to refer to the outstanding event if it occurred within their lifetimes. Needless to say, there is no contemporary evidence, either scriptural or extra-scriptural, that Mary's body was raised to heaven. Catholic theory, however, postulates that the revelation of divine truths cannot be said to be finally completed until the death of the last Apostle; and thus the last years of the Apostle John, after the books of the New Testament had been written, provide a period of fog during which non-scriptural happenings, such as the Assumption, could be deemed to occur without inviting any definite disproof for such a supposition. John himself, to whom Jesus committed His mother, would have particular reason to write of the Assumption as long as he held a pen in his hand, and it was natural that forged documents bearing his name eventually deceived Gregory of Tours into receiving the Assumption as a fact at the end of the sixth century. About a century earlier the idea appears to have been condemned by Pope Gelasius, but there is the usual doubt about whether he did condemn or what he actually condemned. What there can be no doubt about is that there is no orthodox witness to the fact of an Assumption until five centuries after the event is supposed to have taken place. No serious historian would be bothered with such evidence.

When Roman Catholic theologians set out to show that the Assumption is ripe for definition, one finds in their case two yawning fallacies. The first fallacy is that a continuous tradition of fourteen centuries is adequate evidence for something that happened nineteen centuries ago. The tradition of belief in the Assumption among Catholics is one of great historical magnitude, but it falls short disastrously of the supposed historical event itself. Five centuries of previous silence can

hardly be set aside as mere chance or ascribed to a peculiar discretion among the early Christians. The fact is that, venerable as is the present tradition behind the Assumption, it does not go back far enough. It does not reach the beginning.

The second fallacy is occasioned by the attempt to retrieve this position in an altogether different field, that of theology. Part of the argument for the Immaculate Conception was that the sinless son necessitated a sinless mother, though why the sinless mother did not necessitate a sinless grandparent is not clear. This dubious proposition now becomes the premiss for a further conclusion. If the mother was sinless, it was "fitting" that her body should not see corruption but be restored to her spirit in heaven. Just as the Immaculate Conception places the Virgin on a par with Jesus in exemption from original sin, so the Assumption parallels the ascension of Jesus and His escape from the tomb. The pursuit of this parallel between Jesus and Mary has already proceeded rather far, and may go even farther. It is quite likely that once the Assumption has been defined a way will be prepared for the definition of yet another Marian doctrine, the doctrine which confers on her the title of "Mediatrix of all graces," or even more boldly "the Co-redeemer." While the Assumption may be regarded as merely a superfluous doctrine, that of the Co-redeemer would indicate in Catholicism a subversion of a central tenet of Christianity, namely the unique embassy between God and Man held by Jesus. The point of present importance, however, is not what more serious developments are likely to follow out of a definition of the Assumption, nor the parlous logic of "fitness" which carries theologians such a bewildering distance. It is the ridiculous notion that from a theological argument you can establish an historical fact. The historical data on which to build up a certitude for the Assumption is, to put it mildly, quite inadequate. Only a mind which allows nothing for the myth-making propensity of the human imagination could find conviction in a belief which does not develop until centuries after the event it proposes, and even then only appears in various fantastic forms. Only a mind insusceptible to criticism could attempt to make good a paucity of historical evidence by a theological argument about what is "fitting" in divine providence, as though the Assumption of the Virgin must have occurred because it ought to have occurred.

Even supposing the Assumption was an attested historical event, it would not follow that it was a fit subject for a religious dogma. To a Christian the only matters suitable for definition as truths of faith are those things pertinent to the Christian plan of salvation, matters such as the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, etc. These are central doctrines of the Christian Faith, not one of which could be omitted without altering the structure of traditional Christianity. The Assumption, however, even if a fact, could lie only on the circumference of Christianity. Its acceptance or rejection does not in itself modify the plan of the faith, though by its tendency it inevitably magnifies the importance of Mary at the expense of Jesus. It is inessential doctrine, if doctrine at all. Common prudence and experience in handling human nature would guide us to making our dogmas

as few as possible. It is difficult to keep a body of people united to more than one idea at a time. The unity we may expect them to exhibit is in inverse proportion to the number of doctrines we lay upon their acceptance. A new definition of doctrine is therefore a cause of schism and ought not to be contemplated without some cogent reason. The wish "to honour Mary" hardly constitutes such a reason and dubiously makes amends for the added confusion of doctrine on earth, separating Christians from one another and damaging their collective witness before the armies of the world.

In making the definition the Pope will be bound to accompany it with a declaration that the Assumption was a belief common to the Primitive Church, and indeed was passed on by the Apostles themselves, for the terms of his infallible prerogative do not permit him to add fresh matter to the Catholic faith but only to reinterpret the original teachings of Christianity. This adventurous declaration will be exposed to the criticism that, as far as documentary evidence goes, the Apostles and Church Fathers had not heard of the Assumption. The very word "Assumption" appears first in the canons of Bishop Sonnatius of Rheims (*c.* 630), replacing the earlier "Falling Asleep," a less significant phrase still in use in the East. Thus there is no reason whatever to think that the Assumption figured in the beliefs of the Primitive Church, although this is an essential condition for the exercise of the Pope's infallible prerogative in framing a definition of it today. An equally deadly criticism is that until very recently the Assumption, even though accepted as a true event, has never been regarded as part of the Christian Faith. Until the reform of 1570, the official Roman Breviary itself contained a lesson from a supposed letter of Jerome, in which he is made to say that no one knows what has happened to the body of Mary. It is not in its tomb, but whether or not assumed to heaven cannot be known. This is from the official service-book of the Church, and it demonstrates that less than four hundred years ago the Roman Catholic Church professed ignorance of a doctrine which tomorrow she proposes to make an obligation on the conscience of her 350 million children.

It is clear that the Pope cannot exercise his infallible function without raising afresh the issue of 1870. The vindication of Papal Infallibility depends on the way that power is employed. Any use made of it must tend either to confirm or contradict the reality of the Pope's prerogative. If he defines a truth soundly based in Christian tradition (there is, of course, little occasion for such definition), the prestige of Papal Infallibility is increased or at least maintained; but if he defines as of faith something which is controversial or absurd, the idea of Papal Infallibility becomes correspondingly dubious. In this doctrinal province the proof of the pudding is very much in the eating. A definition of the Assumption, a doctrine infirm on both the historical and theological planes as well as defective in traditional importance, must react unfavourably on the standing of the Papacy. The Pope cannot afford to blunder, and, though it would temporarily amuse the Protestant world to see him do so, the overall cost to the esteem which the Churches share together would far outweigh the

value of the entertainment. The time is short and the definition now in preparation is a difficult thing to avert, but those who are able to bring to bear any influence, direct or indirect, on the Roman authorities should render that service to the cause of Christian defence.

VICTOR BENNETT.

Ad Vestem Sacerdotis

(The following is a metrical version of the fine hymn sung by the choir in the Armenian [Byzantine] Liturgy while the priest is vesting; see Brightman, L.E.W., p. 412.)

Creator Eternal, O mystery deep and unsearchable,
Who deckest with splendour and glory the heavenly dominions,
And orderest high in the chamber of light unapproachable
The legions of ministering spirits on fiery pinions—

In a lordly image, Thine own, and with wonder and power
Thou didst Adam create and didst clothe him with grace and with glory,
Didst set him in Eden, delightsome with fruit and with flower.
He fell. And Thou, in a yet more wonderful story,

Thy creatures renewest, and man, be it never forgotten,
Once more is immortal and clad in the vesture of heaven,
Redeemed and set free by the pains of Thine Only-begotten;
Nor devil nor man may him strip of the robe Thou hast given.

O Spirit Most Holy, Thy chalice of fire down raining
In the upper room where Apostles are waiting and praying,
Pour Thy wisdom on us, as each priest, things earthly disdaining,
To stand before God in the vestment himself is arraying.

Holy art Thou in the heavens and with majesty clothéd;
Holy Thy Temple, for ever its comeliness holy;
With glory and holiness girt, to us Thy betrothéd
Give also the girdle of truth in our ministry lowly.

Widespread the arms of Thy might when, in the beginning,
Stars sprang to life, sang Thy praise in eternal confession;
When we lift our hands for our people to keep them from sinning,
Give power to our prayer that we fail not in our intercession.

When the crown wreathes our head and the stole on our breast is lying,
Decked with the cross of the Christ, with gold interwoven
And flowers like Aaron's, Thy sanctuary's honour supplying:
Bind our thoughts and our senses to Thee in obedience well-proven.

Supreme, divine Sovereign, all beings stand humbly before Thee;
Heaven's King, for this mystery holy weak men hast Thou taken,
With love as a robe Thou dost cover our service unworthy;
Uphold us in peace who Thee worship; Thy Church keep unshaken.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

Why You Should Read It—XIII

Social Interests of Wordsworth's "Ecclesiastical Sonnets."

The necessity of making out a "case" for the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" of Wordsworth might seem to be desirable nowadays, since so many readers have declared them to be among the poet's least interesting compositions. Only recently, for instance, Mr Roy Fuller, in *Our Time* for November, 1946, has spoken of the "deadly dull 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets' "—though he does allow them to be "dignified"! But the sonnets have occasionally met with approval. Matthew Arnold once said that he could "read the whole series of 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets' with pleasure": though even he qualified the statement with "together with the address to Mr Wilkinson's spade and the 'Thanksgiving Ode.' " In 1923, however, Stephen Liberty, in an address on "Religion in Wordsworth" remarking that these sonnets had not perhaps had justice done to them because of a natural prejudice called up in most minds by the title "Ecclesiastical," describes the series as an achievement memorable, not only for its influence on English thought, but for the high poetic level of much of its contents! One suspects that this opinion may be based partly on a particular affection for the small number of the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" (such as "Mutability" and "Tax not the royal saint . . .") which really are well known. But in his chapter on Wordsworth in *The Starlit Dome* Mr Wilson Knight gives an appreciation of these sonnets which appears to be founded on a rather wider awareness of the poetical elements of the whole series and their relation to Wordsworth's development as an artist at the time they were written. He denies that Wordsworth "satisfactorily fuses his various interests in the 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets,' " and later, "a blend of national and religious allegiances is the whole purpose of these essentially British sonnets." A conviction that, in his own subtle way, Wilson Knight has possibly detected that the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" could be made to yield a "message" for Britain, and that "national" in this context requires some explanation, invites attention to the "social" interests which form part of their background.

In order to derive an idea of these various "interests," we have to examine the state of Wordsworth's mind and character when he was composing the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets." It was on March 27, 1821, that Dorothy Wordsworth wrote to Mr and Mrs Clarkson: "William is at present composing a series of sonnets on a subject which I am sure you would never divine—the Church of England—but you will perceive that, in the hands of a poet, it is one that will furnish ample store of poetic materials . . ." Most of these pieces were composed in 1821 and published the next year, although thirty sonnets were added between 1822 and 1850. But it was probably the state of the country between about 1815 and 1822 which most affected Wordsworth's "thought" on matters of religion and politics. In the early part of 1817 public affairs seemed to be most disturbing. The attack on the Prince Regent while he was going to open Parliament on January 28 was one manifestation of the widespread discontent: the

march of the "Blanketeers" and the suspension of Habeas Corpus were other and graver signs of unrest. Wordsworth shared with other intellectuals the general anxiety that *all* existing establishments would be overthrown. But in spite of his temporary enthusiasm for the aims of the revolutionists he was never in any complete sense an anarchist; stable and well-managed governments were to him always good. He came to believe, however, that just as individual citizens had certain "duties" towards the government of the country they lived in, so in turn the government had obvious and definable obligations to its people. Of the spheres (among others) where this had the strongest application Wordsworth thought that the relief of poverty and the provision of elementary education were perhaps the most important. His "Of Legislation for the Poor" was not written until 1835; but he held most of the views expressed there by 1820. On education he had been writing a good deal in one form or another for several years. In Book IX of the "Excursion," for instance, he had spoken (line 293) of

> that glorious time
> When, prizing knowledge as her noblest wealth
> And best protection, this imperial Realm,
> While she exacts allegiance, shall admit
> An obligation on her part, to *Teach*
> Them who are born to serve her and obey;

The whole passage is relevant to the background of the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" and must be quoted further. Wordsworth speaks of the state:

> Binding herself by statute to secure
> For all the children whom her soil maintains
> The rudiments of letters, and inform
> The mind with moral and religious truth.
> Both understood and practised—so that none,
> However destitute, be left to droop
> By timely culture unsustained . . .

And in the Fenwick notes of 1843 ("The Excursion," of course, belongs to a much earlier date: it was published in August, 1814) Wordsworth, apparently fully aware of the work of Lord Shaftesbury and Sir James Graham, saw no reason to retract these arguments. Such "education" as he envisages in "The Excursion," however, cannot be left in the hands of "private enterprise": it is urgent that the government should provide it. But "specialized" education, imparted merely to fit men to earn a living, was not enough. And Wordsworth believed that an "all round" education even for the artisan classes must involve a knowledge of religion. He thought with Carlyle that "an irreverent knowledge is no knowledge . . . it is no culture of the soul of man." And in pressing home this important truth he was led to a close association with views held by several prominent Anglican churchmen. About this time he was continually thinking on the position of a National Church and its relation to other churches. He had always opposed the dissenting interests; he preferred to conceive of a strong and well-ordered Anglican Church standing, as it were, in *loco parentis* to the people of a country well governed by

a freely elected government. Wordsworth may have been influenced by Coleridge in this matter (and vice versa). In the *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge conceives of an established Church as providing "a 'nucleus' round which the capabilities of the place may crystallize and brighten," etc. The *Biographia* was written in 1817. And Wordsworth and Coleridge had evidently not been alone in thinking that the strongest defence of internal peace lay in a well-established National Church; in that year Parliament voted one million pounds for the foundation of new churches throughout the country. When in 1829 Wordsworth voted against the Catholic Relief Bill he was censured by those who (remembering other matters) wished to prove him a "reactionary." It appears that Wordsworth took this step in the hope that by so doing he would be helping yet further to found a homogeneous established Church, which would eventually (and kindly) destroy Romanism in England, and so remove the civil grievances the Bill had been designed to palliate.

It is noticeable that in all these dealings with ecclesiastical and educational affairs Wordsworth has one main interest, broadly represented by the word "culture" as used in the lines from the "Excursion." It is, however, some time before this interest—and the others related to it—manifests itself in the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets"; but the series is so planned that it is thrown into prominence when Wordsworth does come to it. In the "Duddon Sonnets" he had written of an actual river. For the purpose of the "Ecclesiastical" series the Christian Faith is imagined as a stream, and Wordsworth proposes to trace:—

> upon the heights of Time the source
> Of a Holy River, on whose banks are found
> Sweet pastoral flowers.
>
> (Part I, sonnet (1))

The river image was a useful one. But it left the poet in something of a quandary when he came to the less fluent aspects of Church history. What he does is to take separate incidents and tendencies and discourse on them in turn, each one helping on the narration and giving relevance to the preceding stages. The "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" are not therefore a mere versified history; they rather present aspects of the past selected by Wordsworth for his own purpose of indicating the Church's importance at particular times. Thus in the eleventh sonnet of Part I he describes the Saxon Conquest:

> Heaven's high will
> Permits a second and a darker shade
> Of Pagan night.

and speaks of:

> . . . men yet scarcely conscious of a care
> For other monuments than those of earth;
> Who, as the fields and woods have given them birth,
> Will build their savage fortunes only there;
> Content, if foes, and barrow, and the girth,
> Of long drawn rampart, witness what they were.
>
> (I. 11)

The interest of this lies in Wordsworth's recognition of the extent to which paganism, anterior to the time when the Christian religion could be felt as a civilizing agent, demeaned and stultified the human spirit: the only "monuments" men wanted then were those uncreated by man himself, the only fortunes they aspired to were "savage" ones, etc. And this account is not invalidated by Wordsworth's own note to the effect that the last six lines of the sonnet are "chiefly from the prose of Daniel." Wordsworth "versifies" with extraordinary skill. Perhaps the best example in the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" is Sonnet XXVIII in this part, on the subject of Dunstan:

> Urg'd by Ambition, who with subtlest skill
> Changes her means . . .

where the essential ideas of thirty-five pages from Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons* are presented in fourteen lines. Apart from this, however, the sonnet is notable for revealing obliquely the interests Wordsworth was to develop more extensively after coming to the subject of the Reformation. He characterizes Dunstan as an "enthusiast," "soaring" as a "dupe" (of the people):

> And as a hypocrite can stoop
> And turn the instruments of good to ill,
> Moulding the credulous people to his will,
> . . . from its Benedictine coop
> Issues the master Mind, at whose fell swoop
> The chaste affections tremble to fulfil
> Their purposes . . . (I. 28)

At this early stage in the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" Wordsworth is beginning to indicate how a perversion of religion affects "the people" whose credulousness is not, significantly, given here as a fault. Ordinary people are seen to be actuated by "chaste" affections which "fulfil" their purposes, but only in trembling when the perverter comes along. The easy juxtaposition of "chaste" and "affections" at this point, it may be remarked, seems so natural that we are inclined to raise no objection to Wordsworth's borrowing of "fell swoop" from *Macbeth*. The first part of the sonnets leads up to an account of what Wordsworth calls the "Consummation of Papal Dominion." To make this "dominion" most apparent he has to survey other fields beyond the purely Papal one: he has, for instance, to expose the enemies of the Church of Rome as well as to reveal the Church's own virtues. He deals, therefore, with such things as the Danish Conquests, the Crusades, the Norman Conquest, and so on. Up to this point, then, the series has been more exclusively ecclesiastical. Here and there, however, extraneous considerations relating to Wordsworth's other interests do enter. In Sonnet XXIV there is an admirable account of the social nature of mediæval ecclesiastical craftsmanship: the sonnet is called "Saxon Monasteries, and Lights and Shades of Religion":

> The people work like congregated bees;
> Eager to build the quiet Fortresses
> Where Piety, as they believe, obtains
> From Heaven a *General* blessing . . .

There are several things here requiring comment. Wordsworth evidently had a strong belief that a kind of communal life, so different from that "civilization" implied by the "increasing accumulation of men in cities," partly justified the construction of the monasteries. The suggestion of animation in the "bee" image contrasts with the calm and security of "quiet Fortresses" in recognition that, in spite of all the bustle and unrest of ordinary mundane existence, man's soul can find rest in religious observances. And just as the business of constructing an edifice to the glory of God is a communal one, so, when the work is completed, the piety which has produced it receives a "general" blessing: the workers share the benefit equally. Vestiges of this sense of community in worship (whether by "bold faith" or in "works") must have remained alive in the peasant society in which Wordsworth himself originated.

In the second part of the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" Wordsworth deals with monastic life more fully. The Papal dominion, though sometimes miserably, often monstrously abused (Part II, Sonnet 2), had its positive value:

> Realm there is none that if controlled or sway'd
> By her commands partakes not, in degree,
> Of good, o'er manners, arts and arms, diffused:

It is interesting to note this order, with manners preceding arts and arms. In "The Excursion" (Book III, line 392 onwards) Wordsworth had commended the monastic life, with its inward and outward "confirmed tranquillity" and its "undissolving fellowship." By 1822 his feelings about monasticism had changed a little: he was more critical, but still not altogether hostile to the ideal of monastic existence. And in the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" he fully appreciates the contribution which "Monks and Schoolmen" (Part II, Sonnet 5) have made to society in general:

> unambitious Men,
> Counsellors for the world, of piercing ken;
> Whose fervent exhortations from afar
> Move princes to their duties . . .

Perhaps the most generous account of monastic life occurs in the fourth sonnet of this part. The third sonnet has described how in a Cistercian monastery the ascetic can find confident assurance of a pure and disciplined life of undisturbed devotion: in the fourth Wordsworth discusses the example which monks often afforded, through the lives they led, to the world outside the cloister. It is interesting to observe how, when he comes to deal with the peasant and the quality of his life, Wordsworth's rhythms begin to run somewhat more easily:

> Deplorable his lot who tills the ground,
> His whole life long tills it, with heartless toil
> Of villein-service, passing with the soil
> To each new master like a steer or hound . . .

In their own domains, evidently, the monks loosen the "iron chains" which bind the average mediæval peasant and attempt to persuade the

feudal lords to abandon the "legalized oppression" of villeinage. The appeal is directly to Christian principle: God Himself did not disdain to put on man's nature; and man, for whose soul Christ died, deserves a better fate than economic bondage. In subsequent sonnets Wordsworth touches on other benefits arising from the organization of monastic life. They are largely of a cultural and artistic nature: but in Wordsworth's estimation the needs of the ordinary people take precedence over the claims of "culture," in the sense in which the word is ordinarily understood. And that, in spiritual matters, the Catholic ritual did not (in his estimation) minister fully to those needs is evident from the sonnet on transubstantiation. Wordsworth is suspicious of the "awe and supernatural horror" which the ceremony of the elevation of the Host breeds in the populace:

> All the people bow their heads, like reeds
> To a soft breeze in holy adoration.
> (II. 11)

Some Catholic prelates, like Valdo, Wordsworth points out, neglected to take notice of this aspect of the mass: and his followers still seek to teach the vulgar to "adore the Invisible." Papal unity should, Wordsworth claims, have enabled men to "form spirit and character from holy writ." Thus the Vaudois, who

> for the Saviour Lord
> Have long borne witness as the Scriptures teach.
> (II. 12)

commend themselves to him. Practical Christianity conducted in the interests of all is the first desideratum. What, Wordsworth asks, are penance, vigils and mortification worth,

> If cloistered Avarice, scruple not to wrong
> The pious, humble, useful Secular,
> And rob the people of his daily care
> Scorning that world whose blindness makes her strong?
> (II. 19)

The central theme of this poem, which relates to several others, is clear; the clergy as a whole have a responsibility towards the people: and the monasteries must not minimize this by jeopardizing the position of the secular clergy. Beyond all this, however, Wordsworth seems further to be implying that all men have a right of access to the Word of God, that they must be allowed opportunity to form their own opinions about it and put it to use in directing their lives. This is seen most noticeably perhaps when, after speaking of monastic voluptuousness and the dissolution of the monasteries, Wordsworth comes to write his sonnet called "Translation of the Bible." One may, he argues, have some regrets for what the "unsparing hurricane" of the Reformation has taken away; but it is as well to be without the "bulls, pardons, relics," etc., which during the unenlightened ages were open to so much abuse throughout the Catholic world. To outweigh all harm, however, the Bible is now available in our native tongue: and

Wordsworth passes at once to what is for him the chief importance of this:

> he who guides the plough, or wields the crook
> With understanding spirits now may look
> Upon her records, listen to her song
> And sift her laws . . .

(One may note in passing that in this last sentence Wordsworth has enumerated casually, as it were, three of the main "cultural" fields—narrative, poetical and moral—to which a perusal of the Bible allows entrance!) Wordsworth enthusiastically calls this a

> Transcendent Boon! noblest that earthly King
> Ever bestowed . . .
>
> (II. 29)

And he sees that as an act of "popular education" the translation of the Bible had great potentialities to "equalize and bless" the common people under their weight of "mortal wretchedness," for there is a chance now that Holy Writ may be able to speak directly for itself without having to utilize the agency of untrustworthy clerics. It is the "wrong which Faith has suffered" in this way which troubles Wordsworth; and in the concluding three lines of the sonnet he warns us that the onset of bigotry ("passions spreading like plagues") may vitiate this "offering" which the translators have made. In the sonnet on the "Revival of Popery," however, his attitude towards the People seems to have changed (the use of the capital letter may denote that he is referring here to the Queen's more immediate followers):

> O People keen
> For change, to whom the new looks always green.
>
> (II. 33)

for he writes as though the people were responsible, because of *their* indifference and complacency, for the Marian "counter-proclamation" (which Wordsworth saw as a step back towards paganism—"their Gods of wood and stone," etc.). The rather hesitating movement of this sonnet seems to argue that Wordsworth was not perhaps fully aware of all the issues involved in this temporary revival of Popery and that his feelings had become somewhat confused. In the earlier poem the knowledge that the Holy Book was translated into the *native* tongue had taken him back at once to the fortunes of the peasantry towards whom he had clearly defined attitudes.

Wordsworth's most explicit statement in the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" of the "social" importance of religion is contained in the third part, which deals with events since the Restoration of Charles II. Of general interest are the sonnets on Latitudinarianism, Nonconformity, and aspects of Christianity in America. Immediately following these is a group dealing directly with the offices of the Church. In considering this subject, Wordsworth straightway fixed on the *duty* attaching to the religious vocation. He addresses the bishops and priests:

> Charged as ye are by Christ to feed and keep
> From wolves your portion of His chosen sheep . . .
>
> (III. 16)

and passes to the place of worship, imagining it as affording a shelter:

> Where a few villagers on bended knees
> Find solace which a busy world disdains.
> (III. 17)

The parsonage, home of "religion's watchful Lord," should, he says, offer

> A genial hearth, a hospitable board,
> And a refined rusticity . . .
> (III. 19)

It should, in fact, be a cultural "nucleus" such as Coleridge had in mind in the passage quoted earlier. In the note to the eighteenth sonnet on "Pastoral Character," Wordsworth comments that among the benefits arising from an adequate Church establishment would be the presence in all country districts of an educated clergy, who would act as a principal bulwark against barbarism and "the link which unites the sequestered peasantry with the intellectual advancement of the age." Their tastes, he adds, as revealed in rural residences and scenery, even now often furnish models which country gentlemen who are more at liberty to follow the caprices of fashion might profit by! All this gives added relevance to the sonnets dealing with the liturgy, baptism, catechism, confirmation, etc., which follow towards the end of the sequence. And it justifies the stress given in the last six sonnets to the subject of ecclesiastical architecture—another "interest" of these sonnets which should not go unnoticed. Wordsworth had indeed an extensive curiosity about the art of church architecture and a certain sensitivity towards its beauty, which found expression in what must be one of the most perfect lines written by any poet of the Romantic period. In the sonnet on the "Inside of King's College Chapel" he speaks of the branching roof, "self-poised and scooped into ten thousand cells":

> where music dwells
> Lingering—and wandering on as loth to die . . .
> (III. 43)

It would be difficult, surely, to find an instance where sound and movement in poetry combine so effectively to force the words into a communication of their meaning.

To conclude with one of Wordsworth's most successful passages is fortunate. For of all the major English poets none, it seems, is so easy to deride as he is. And the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" are among those works usually cited to illustrate how commonplace Wordsworth's poetry can on occasion be. They may not, as a whole, be "great" poetry. But their merely technical deficiencies would hardly diminish the not inconsiderable importance of these poems in Wordsworth's total achievement. Regarding the "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" as a sequence, we begin to perceive that for him religion was not really comprehensible except in relation to the quality of ordinary social life and "society" (conversely) implied its corresponding notion of religion. And, far from being conceived *in vacuo*, religion was with Wordsworth

related simultaneously to his other main preoccupations. A superficial reading of the sonnets does not, perhaps, give one this impression. It is only after further exploration that the success of the "fusion" of interests, which Wilson Knight has failed to discover, becomes apparent. And this is seen to be essentially a poetic success; the non-poetic elements possibly covered by the "national" allegiances are only marginal and subsidiary.

E. D. Mackerness.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. G. Hebert is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

Mr Bennett is a Roman Catholic schoolmaster.

Dr Prideaux is a Canon and Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral.

Mr Mackerness, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, has been appointed to a Visiting Fellowship at Princeton University.

CORRESPONDENCE

"SHALIACH"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Dom Gregory Dix has replied to my short note at some length. The main point of dispute between us is this: supposing that ἀπόστολος represents a Semitic word *shaliach*, does this word *shaliach* necessarily mean more than deputy or agent? Is it a technical term denoting a representative *invested with full power*? My contention is that the word itself cannot be pressed to mean more than "agent," and that the powers assigned to the agent must be inferred from the context in which the word occurs.

In *Beraketh*, v. 5, for instance, *shaliach* denotes the precentor who, as "the agent of the congregation," recites the prayers. Surely it would be misleading to speak of a precentor as a plenipotentiary (even though he might, unfortunately for the congregation, regard himself as such).

No doubt the Church, in speaking of the Eleven as "Apostles," regarded them as agents, in a general sense, of our Lord; but to call them "plenipotentiaries" is going beyond the necessary meaning of the term itself.

I must still maintain that the note of that eminent scholar, Dr Kirsopp Lake, on the word ἀπόστολος in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 46-52, is a valuable contribution to the study of this subject. Dom Gregory Dix writes, "I ignored Lake's note, because it had not entered my head that anyone now alive could take its thesis seriously." If Dom Gregory Dix had taken Lake's note seriously, it would at least have led him to Dr F. Gavin's article on *Shaliach and Apostolos* in the *Anglican Theological Review* (1927-8), ix, pp. 250-9, and to the "excellent abstract" which it contains of "two important articles" by H. Vogel-

stein, of which Dom Gregory admits his ignorance when he wrote his essay in the volume edited by the Bishop of Oxford. Dr Kirsopp Lake specifically refers to Dr Gavin's article (in a footnote on p. 49) and takes it into account in his careful examination of Harnack's thesis—which, says Dom Gregory Dix, "he rejected in one condescending sentence . . . p. 46." There is no mention of Harnack on page 46. The sentence to which Dom Gregory Dix refers is at the top of page 48:

"It has been suggested, notably by Harnack in his *Mission und Ausbreitung*, ed. 4, pp. 340*ff*., that the word was first adopted by Jews, but the evidence, though interesting, scarcely amounts to demonstration. The facts are as follows . . ." And then Dr Kirsopp Lake goes on to present the facts on which his conclusion is based.

Dom Gregory Dix speaks appreciatively (and with good reason) of Dr F. Gavin's article. But what were Dr Gavin's own conclusions? Dom Gregory Dix does not quote the following sentence:[1]

"Is there any precise and certain demonstration of a true 'apostolate' of name, function and status in Judaism of the first century? It is impossible categorically to answer this question in the affirmative. The term *shaliach* (*shaluach*) is too frequently used in the non-technical sense of agent, representative, deputy and the like to allow us clearly and sharply to delimit an institutional 'apostolate,' whether of name or specified function."

This view of the actual use of the word *shaliach* is just that for which I was contending in my note. I would not maintain that the word was never used in such a context as to make it a technical, or almost technical, term. But I do submit that it was often used in a non-technical sense.

Dr Gavin goes on modestly to say: "It may also be suggested that the weight of probability as of plausibility lies on the side of a Jewish indebtedness rather than the borrowing from non-Jewish institutions, ideas and customs." But he adds: "The term Apostle in early Christian literature does not completely define itself, either as to authorizing power, content of function, status or relationship. It is apparently employed in different senses. Specification, whether of character or power, is not precise."

Yours sincerely,
J. W. Truron.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I would like to offer a few "footnotes" on some of the minor points in the article entitled "The Christian Shaliach and the Jewish Apostle—a Reply," by Dom Gregory Dix, in the July number of Theology, pp. 249-56. Without such footnotes it is possible that some of your readers might fail to understand the value of the evidence quoted. The points are these:

[1] pp. 257, 258.

(i) On page 250 we read that "in the LXX the word ἀπόστολος is used to translate the word *shaliach* in the Hebrew text."

(ii) On page 251, lines 12 *ff.*, we read particulars of "the verb *shalach* in the Hebrew O.T." which include the statement "Its *pual* participle *shaliach* is rare (seven times) and found only once substantivally (1 Kings xiv, 6), where LXX translates by ἀπόστολος."

My footnotes are these:

(*a*) The word *shaliach* does not occur in the Hebrew O.T.

(*b*) *Shaliach* is not the *pual* participle of the verb *shalach*.

(*c*) The *pual* participle of the verb *shalach* occurs in the Hebrew O.T. three times only (Proverbs xxix, 15, of an unrestrained child; Isaiah xvi, 2, probably of deserted chickens; Isaiah xxvii, 10, of a forsaken or deserted city).

(*d*) Neither the word *shaliach*, nor the *pual* participle of the verb *shalach*, occurs in 1 Kings xiv, 6.

(*e*) In 1 Kings xiv, 6 the ordinary passive participle *Qal* of the verb *shalach* (namely, *shaluach*) is used.

(*f*) That phrase in 1 Kings xiv, 6 is translated by C. F. Burney, a competent Hebraist, by "seeing that I am sent unto thee with something harsh." There is no reason to dispute his translation or the rest of his note (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 189), in which he paraphrases "given in commission something harsh."

(*g*) It is perhaps only fair to add that 1 Kings xiv, 6 (III Kingdoms xiv, 6) is the only passage in the LXX in which the word ἀπόστολος is used.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

H. St J. Hart.

Queens' College, Cambridge.
July 8, 1948.

"SOME PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES OF REUNION"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

My article in your April number seems to have given rise to so much comment, both in your pages and among your readers, that I beg leave to add one or two points and to re-emphasize some that have been misunderstood.

(1) Mr Daniel Jenkins is honest enough to admit my general thesis (even if he questions my interpretation of some of the evidence) that Nonconformity is in a terribly weak state, both in preaching and in matters of Church Order. I therefore feel obliged to repeat that my article was also concerned with weaknesses in the Church of England, and proposed the thesis that it is just at the points at which she is weakest that Nonconformity is even weaker, and that therefore "Oecumenicity" and the "Renewal of the Church" do not seem to be naturally connected.

(2) It is rash of Mr Jenkins, who, I understand, is not now in a pastoral charge, to undertake criticism of my carefully collected com-

ments on the administration of baptism among the Nonconformist bodies. He seems to be quite unaware that there is any problem here. The only answer to the charges contained in my article would be a statement of the conditions under which the sacraments are administered in the various denominations, with some statistics of the numbers of chapels in which such conditions are conscientiously fulfilled. I think Mr Jenkins would find the collection of such information very instructive.

(3) May I be allowed, on behalf of those who helped in the compilation of my article, to draw attention to Mr Jenkins' extraordinary statement that "most large-scale attempts at evangelization almost automatically become interdenominational." We should rather say that in so far as they have been interdenominational they have been unsuccessful. A long tale of Religion and Life Weeks, Commando Campaigns, and Orders of Christian Witness have, as far as we are concerned, not only shown up the futility of this artificial co-operation, but have also exposed the terrible insipidity of the "Agreed Syllabus" type of religion which is so demonstrably failing to convert. My impression is that the majority of parish priests in my area are heartily sick of such efforts.

(4) Mr Tomkins is unnecessarily sensitive of the reputation of central offices. My experience is that the parish clergy are prepared to hear what they have to say; and only ask that in return the clergy of the parishes should at least have a chance to state their mind before the central offices of the Church formulate the policies which they expect the clergy to implement. This opportunity has simply not been given.

I am, Sir,
Yours sincerely,
BERNARD C. PAWLEY.

THE RECTORY,
ELLAND.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TRIUMPH OF GOD. A series of essays edited by Max Warren. Longmans. 15s.

Today we often hear that many clergy and layfolk are despondent and defeatist because of the widespread indifference of our countrymen to the Church's existence and message. The cure for such defeatism, if it really exists, is to lift up one's eyes to the fields and to consider the evidences which point to God's triumph in the achievement of His purpose for the world. This book, however, is to be recommended, not merely as a tonic for tired Christians, but rather as a stimulus to fresh and intelligent zeal on the part of all who look for the coming of Christ's Kingdom. It does not minimize the difficulties of evangelism in the modern world, but by facing them it helps us to re-fashion our fundamental message in terms of the actual situation in which the Church is placed today, so that that message may be clearly stated in

language which must command men's attention and secure their understanding, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

The twelve contributors have served the universal Church in different parts of the world, and they are able to illuminate our local problems with insights drawn from a wide experience of missionary and œcumenical affairs. They are all convinced Anglicans, and they are strong upholders of the historical Anglican attitude towards the great non-episcopal denominations. One of the writers quotes Prof. Sanday: "It should be distinctly borne in mind that the more sweeping refusal to recognize the non-episcopal Reformed Churches is not, and can never be made, a doctrine of the Church of England. Too many representative men have not shared it. . . . Indeed, it is not until the last half of the nineteenth century that more than a relatively small minority of English Churchmen have been committed to it" (p. 193). In an illuminating study of the Church as the People of God, J. P. Hickinbotham in effect reaffirms Hooker's position: "No particular form of Church order and ministry, no one standard Church discipline, no particular doctrinal confession beyond what is clearly contained in Scripture, is essential to the being of the visible Church. But that is not to say that such things are indifferent" (p. 106). The same writer expresses the view that in order to achieve reunion it will be necessary to establish a universally recognized organ of ordination: "this could be achieved by the general acceptance of a reformed and constitutional episcopacy" (p. 111). Not the least part of the value of the book is its clear and definite articulation of an Anglican viewpoint which has been perhaps too diffident in recent years; for here is a doctrine of the Church, of the Word and Sacraments, firmly rooted in the historical biblical-Anglican tradition, which finds no reason to seek escape from the vagueness of "modern" sentimentalism by pressing the Anglican communion (in the words of another writer) "into the mould of a counter-Reformation sect."

It is doubtless invidious to single out certain of the essays for mention, but space does not allow us to treat of them all. Bishop Stephen Neill contributes two chapters; one of them, "The Worship of God," is particularly rich in its historical understanding of Christian worship and in its contemporary illustrations drawn from India and other parts of the world. F. W. Dillistone writes a well-considered essay on eschatology and the Church's missionary task; he concludes that evangelical missionary work was not the outcome of a clear-cut evangelical eschatology: whether the end was near or still to be delayed, the duty of Christians was plain (pp. 85*f.*). He contrasts the Christian hope with that of Marxism, the rival eschatologies between which our generation in every land is being asked today to choose. L. W. Brown's essay on "The Knowledge of God" states effectively the necessity of making the understanding of theological truth a primary concern of the whole Church, and especially of its lay members: "when laymen see that there is truly no salvation for the world except in the faith they profess, they will be constrained to think about it and tell others of it" (p. 159). Canon Herklots writes an informative and strikingly illustrated chapter on "The Church and 'the Churches,' " in which

he gives a vivid sketch of the origins and development of what is nowadays called the œcumenical movement, "the great new fact of our time" (in Archbishop Temple's widely quoted words). Other chapters deal with several aspects of our world—secularism, Islam, the ancient religious cultures, tribal religion, Church and State, world literacy. The editor contributes an epilogue, "A Brotherhood of Expectancy": "the Triumph of God is where the victorious community is in active life. At present it is in little scattered groups all over the world—but already it is united in the Una Sancta—and our day is seeing a new effort towards the co-ordination of its strategy. In a true sense it is not secret but visible. Yet it is a mystery only partly revealed. . . . The Church is still the crucified Church. The Parousia will be the Church's resurrection" (pp. 363*f.*). Altogether the volume forms a notable effort to re-think the whole Gospel of the Church and her Bible and to understand in the light of it the "divine strategy" behind the events of our times, which is preparing the way for the ultimate Triumph of God.

DURHAM. ALAN RICHARDSON.

A HISTORY OF JEWISH MYSTICISM. By Ernst Muller. East and West Library, Oxford. 8s. 6d.

Here is another of the attractive publications of the Phaidon Press. The preface tells us that the writer's purpose is "to give a comprehensive survey of the history of Jewish mysticism—one which shall cover the whole field and not only that part commonly known as Cabbalah." To attempt such a task in the space of less than two hundred pages, nearly fifty of which are devoted to introductory matter, notes and appendices, will immediately strike the reader as virtually an impossibility. Nevertheless the author, already well known for his writings on the subject, does not ignore the gigantic difficulties involved. By careful notes appended to each chapter, by a useful appendix in the form of an anthology of Jewish mystical writings ranging from the apocryphal Book of Wisdom down to some examples of Chassidic literature, and by a general bibliography and index of names the interested student is pointed to more detailed works and, more important still, to the original sources themselves.

The book traces Jewish mysticism from its source in the Bible through subsequent periods to the Cabbalistic age, whole chapters being devoted to "the Zohar" and "Chassidism," and a final chapter to "Cabbalistic tendencies outside Judaism." The largest amount of space is rightly given to a description of the contents and teaching of the Zohar, and this is perhaps the most valuable part of the book. To anyone who has read Prof. Scholem's *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem, 1941) this work will inevitably seem slight and scientifically somewhat unsatisfactory. But if it serves as an introduction to the more important work, to which it often refers, this book will fulfil a useful purpose. There is more than a suspicion in the final paragraph of the last chapter that the author in his study of the occult has become caught up in the pursuit of anthroposophy.

Some smaller criticisms may be added. The vexed question of the right transliteration of Hebrew and Aramaic words will probably never be finally settled, but there seem to be some strange inconsistencies in this book. Mr Maurice Simon's translation—the book was originally written in German—is uniformly to be commended; the only words that would seem to offend are the adjectives "Johnian" on pages 51 and 53, and "Alexandrinian" on page 66. Some readers will probably find it rather irritating to be continually forced to refer to the end of each chapter for the notes on the text, and it might well have been possible to print all except the longest notes at the foot of each page. There are quite a number of printing errors and not a few discrepancies in various parts of the text, even the title appearing differently on the dust cover and in the book itself.

Jerusalem. C. Witton-Davies.

The Christ of Catholicism. By Dom Aelred Graham. Longmans. 21s.

This is Dom Aelred Graham's largest and most comprehensive work. It bears the sub-title, "A Meditative Study," and is advertised as "no abstract treatise in theology and should appeal equally to the normal student and thoughtful layman." It looks and begins, certainly, as though it is meant to be a solid book—it is not just a book of meditation. It is disappointing to find its solidity leads to dullness rather than a new insight into this central article of our common faith.

The author is professor of dogmatic theology at Ampleforth Abbey, and can but write in the vein of "the Church to teach and the Bible to prove." He is obviously an able teacher of dogmatic theology: the book moves happily when he is expounding the hypostatic union of our Lord's natures or, with great moderation, the Roman view of the place of the Blessed Virgin. He is also anxious to use the Bible to the full. Nearly half the book is, in fact, little more than a harmony of the Gospels. This is where the dullness weighs most heavily, alas, and what a sin it is to make the Bible appear dull! Yet it is bound so to appear when it is used only as corroborative evidence. In part, this, of course, is due to the author's Roman fundamentalist position. This gives a certain suspicion of untrustworthiness of the evidence: for instance, the author appears to accept both the Marcan and Johannine dating of the Crucifixion in relation to the Passover. More seriously, there can be little discrimination in marshalling the evidence. There are strings of quotations from both testaments, but they are not seen in any very clear perspective. The Old Testament background, the words and works of our Lord are all there, of course, but they are not shown as making that pattern of God's intervention which Biblical theology makes increasingly clear, a pattern which itself spells out the Catholic Christology.

Dom Graham's Biblical exposition is really an appendix to his able exposition of the Thomist Christology and, like most appendices, rather wearisome. It isn't so much Biblical quotations that make

Biblical theology, but the Biblical perspective and method. The author quotes non-Roman authors with respect and appreciation, but it is difficult not to notice a fundamental difference in approach. It is perhaps unfair to compare this book with *The Riddle of the New Testament*, but both books set out to expound the Jesus of the New Testament and are addressed to laymen as well as theologians. *The Riddle*, starting from the New Testament, sees its historical nature demands historical criticism; sees that its different threads tie up into a pattern, growing out of the Old Testament, a pattern of the divine intervention in history. In revealing the nature of that intervention it shows the Catholic Christ in new reality. For all its obscurity, *The Riddle* has something of the excitement of a detective story: it does, in fact, take you somewhere and find something. *The Christ of Catholicism* has the findings all right, the findings of Chalcedon, but it doesn't show very clearly how they were reached from the Bible, and so a great opportunity is lost to show the treasure of the Christian Faith in its full lustre.

CAMBERWELL. J. H. CHURCHILL.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By William Robinson. Berean Press. 1s. 6d.

In 1942 Dr Robinson of Overdale College, Selly Oak, published *A Companion to the Communion Service*, a small book in the Reformed Tradition but of a great richness. One is grateful to the editor for bringing to one's notice this further booklet. Dr Robinson is a skilful writer on behalf of "the Churches of Christ," a Christian community more in evidence in America than here. "For fifteen hundred years, in both East and West, the celebration of the Lord's Supper was the central act of Christian worship, the chief service of each Lord's Day. With the Reformation came a change, in spite of the fact that Calvin himself wished to have the Lord's Supper the chief service of each Lord's Day. . . . In Churches where there is no fixed liturgy, as in Churches of Christ, and in most Presbyterian and Free Churches, the service can so easily be spoiled in word, or in balance, by the Celebrant. . . . This Manual is offered to help those who are called to lead in this service" (from the preface). Speaking of the Churches of Christ and the Catholic Apostolic Church, he says: "in both Churches it is the normal and *natural* thing for every Church member in good standing to be present at the service, and to communicate *every* Lord's Day" (p. 8). He understands much about the corporateness of the Church and her worship. "Another thing which follows from this Churchly and corporate aspect of the service is that any man may act as celebrant if so chosen by the Church. . . . As a matter of orderliness it may be much more seemly and fitting for the Celebrant to be an ordained Presbyter, but as a matter of validity the Church may appoint a man who is neither Evangelist, Presbyter nor Deacon, provided he is a man fitted in other ways" (p. 9). But the ministry lies deeper in the counsels of Christ than mere orderliness. It is the normal

and *natural* thing in Christendom for the Apostolic minister, if present, to be the celebrant. It is the Church of all the Not-on-earths and Yet-on-earths, presided over by the Christ and His companions in the pastorate that must act in the designation of celebrant. However, the amateur celebrants that this pamphlet has in view are indeed in need of direction and guidance. The advice given is so wise and good that Presbyters themselves will not do amiss to digest it. On page 27 it is written: "It goes without saying that the sermon should be delivered by someone other than the celebrant." With the Church of the first centuries, I greet this with the ripost "Nonsense." With the Church of the first century and of many post-sixteenth-century communities the practice advocated here is that of the sevenfold shape of the Last Supper in contrast to the fourfold shape of the Eucharistic Act, as in Justin Martyr and generally ever afterwards. Now that there is no Agape between Loaf and Cup, the change from sevenfold to fourfold shape seems eminently sensible. But one must remember that originally the Berakah or Thanksgiving cannot have been the point and means at, by, which the new meaning was fixed by God in the Church upon the elements. It is a good second-century convention, perhaps even of the first apostolic age, but maybe not to be the universal custom for all time. If the Romanists would do well to purge themselves of the elevation, the Reformed and Lutheran should drop the unscriptural, murderous, mediæval interpretation of the fraction and the seventeenth-century custom of pouring the wine from flagon to chalice. "The Bread represents the Body; the actual breaking of the Bread the sacrificial offering of His Body. The Cup represents His Blood, and where the Wine is contained in a flagon and poured out, the outpouring represents the outpouring of His Blood" (p. 35). Though Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely, and Tho. Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, and Rudolf Otto go in for it, it is not at all the thing. But to close, here is a fine passage: "This is what we come to Sunday by Sunday. We await His coming, who *has* come; we anticipate the Bridal Feast, and yet are in it. Our feet are on earth, and yet we tread the heavenly courts. We are in time, and yet are not in it. We do things which we do in ordinary life, eat and drink together, and yet they are not ordinary, they belong to the life which is to come, and yet, which is already manifested" (p. 42).

Robert P. Symonds.

Scholæ Cancellarii,
Lincoln.

A Kierkegaard Anthology. By Robert Bretall. Oxford University Press. 30s.

Soren Kierkegaard: A Study. By Melville Chaning-Pearce. James Clarke and Co. 4s. 6d.

It is almost a hundred years since Kierkegaard died, and the Hegelianism and Romanticism which he attacked have become common features of our Western civilization. What was the property of the intellectual has now become the unquestioned presupposition of

most ordinary people. It would not be too much to say that our present ethos in this twentieth century is largely the result of Hegel and the Romantics. Of course, there are not a few "intellectuals" who are today questioning our current presuppositions, and it is to them that Kierkegaard speaks; but to the rest he is as much a closed book as he was to his contemporaries. He himself understood this, and even went so far as to regard "every eulogy as an attack, and every attack as being a thing unworthy of notice" (*Point of View*, p. 50). The time may come when what Kierkegaard has to say to the few questioning spirits who understand him will become the presuppositions of the masses, but that time is not yet. A presentation of him *en bloc* to a generation such as ours is a perilous undertaking and renders his writings open to misunderstanding, if not to actual misinterpretation. The missionary zeal with which so many Americans seek to propagate the Kierkegaard cult, much in the manner of some Californian religion, is for this reason unfortunate.

If this *Anthology* claims to be nothing more than a selection of Mr Bretall's favourite passages, like any other anthology, then it is quite legitimate and no one can possibly object: but if it claims to be more—and this seems to be implied by the compiler's desire to let Kierkegaard "speak entirely for himself" (preface vii)—then the position is different. As indicated above, it is doubtful whether he can do that when read *in toto*, far less in anthology, but it might have helped if there had been some extracts from *The Concept of Dread*, which many consider to be essential for the understanding of Kierkegaard's thought. *E.g.*, the statements: "Dread is a sympathetic antipathy and an antipathetic sympathy" (*op. cit.*, p. 30), and "When one uses such expressions as longing, anxious longing, expectation, etc., one commonly overlooks the fact that they imply a precedent state, and hence that this is present and makes itself felt at the same time that longing develops . . . such longing is dread, for in dread the state out of which a man longs to be delivered announces itself, and it announces itself because longing alone is not enough to save the man" (*ibid.*, p. 52): and the whole discussion of the difference between subjective and objective dread shows that dread can be towards good as well as evil. Now this has a direct bearing on much of Kierkegaard's thought, *e.g.*, it throws light on the following statement from *Either/Or*: "As soon as one can get a man to stand at the cross-ways in such a position that there is no recourse but to choose, he will choose the right" (*Anthology*, p. 106). Incidentally, this involves Kierkegaard's conception of choice, which is also discussed at length in *The Concept of Dread.*

Enough has been said to show that much has been left out which is practically essential if the newcomer is to gain a clear view of Kierkegaard from this book. Other examples could be cited: the "Interlude" from the *Philosophical Fragments* throws a revealing sidelight on what is said both about "the world-historical" and the "existential" in the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript.*

But it must be said that Mr Bretall does recognize some of the

limitations of such an anthology. He admits that he has chosen passages which interest him and which he thinks may have an interest for others (preface, p. viii). Although one might not agree with all that is said in the introduction, it makes one wish that the compiler had written instead a book trying to expound Kierkegaard's thought: *e.g.*, the suggestion that Kierkegaard points the way to a Protestant Synthesis parallel to the Mediæval Synthesis of St Thomas Aquinas (p. xxiv) is particularly interesting. Similarly, the little sketches before each extract are helpful and sometimes stimulating. Many will find the short bibliography at the end useful.

It is tempting to draw an analogy between this work and a small salon orchestra which is trying to "render" a pot-pourri of Sibelius' symphonies to a tea-lounge audience.

Mr Chaning-Pearce's little book in the Modern Christian Revolutionary series forms a striking contrast to the *Anthology*. It has only 104 pages, whereas the *Anthology* has 494: by attempting to expound Kierkegaard's thought, however briefly, it is more likely to succeed where the other fails. An unpretentious work, it attempts to estimate the importance of Kierkegaard in various fields—philosophy, psychology and theology—and, although by nature of its size it is necessarily inadequate, nevertheless it provides a much better introduction than the bulky *Anthology*. One welcomes in this book the absence of sentimentalized references to "S.K." such as are to be found in the other book (*e.g.*, preface, p. viii, middle paragraph), and indeed have become a common feature of American writings on the subject.

Hawarden. Murray M'Gregor.

The Church of our Fathers. By Roland Bainton. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

This is a Church history for older children. The prerequisite of the truly œcumenical Church is the œcumenical child. Prof. Bainton's book can help to produce a race of œcumenically minded boys and girls with a vision of what history teaches of the tragedy of a divided Christendom and the power of unity amongst Christians. In the past the Protestant child has known nothing of Church history between the end of the New Testament and the beginning of the Reformation: the Catholic child has looked upon that Reformation as an unmitigated disaster. Your nephews and nieces, children and grandchildren, if they read Prof. Bainton, will know better: indeed, they may display a knowledge discomfiting to their elders on, say, Cardinal Ximenes and the Complutensian Polyglot, or the doctrines of the Cathari, should these names crop up in conversation!

The Professor of Church history at Yale has accomplished the feat of giving in 240 pages of large print a bird's-eye view of his subject from the time of our Lord to the present day. Still more amazing, he manages to include poems, stories and letters about children and details interesting to children, and to combine them with a narrative

which is clear, simple, continuous, comprehensive and scholarly: it is not to be wondered at that the reviewer has heard more than one theological student in America (where the book was published in 1941) on the eve of a Church history examination proposing to "run through" his period in *The Church of our Fathers*.

But Prof. Bainton could never have done what he has, were it not that his skill with his pen is matched by his skill with his pencil. The most original part of the book is its illustrations. He has supplemented the text with over 240 black-and-white illustrations, mostly by himself, taken from illuminated manuscripts, stained glass windows, medals, coins, frescoes, tapestries, statues, and so forth. In each little picture will be found just the detail which will fix in the mind of the child the main point in the text it accompanies. Lucky is the boy or girl who gets a present of *The Church of our Fathers* next birthday or Christmas. But it is only fair to warn them that the book is as fascinating to grown-ups as to juniors. There is distinct risk that John or Mary will be overheard murmuring, "I wonder *when* Mum and Dad are going to let me have a look at my new book."

Geneva. Ruth Rouse.

Religious Liberty. By Cecil Northcott. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

The General Secretary of the London Missionary Society gives us a vigorous exposition in small compass of the world situation of religious liberty today. In most Islamic lands and in some countries where the Roman Catholic Church is in power, notably in Spain and certain parts of Latin America, religious liberty, if it exists at all, exists in a most restricted form. The same tends to be true in areas under the influence of the U.S.S.R.

Mr Northcott is fully alive to the problems to which religious liberty, like other good things, gives rise for governments. He gives a fair, balanced and documented account of the situation in all these regions. His review of the position in the U.S.S.R. is specially valuable. In Islamic lands he shows the very different circumstances which prevail in different areas; for instance, Turkey, Egypt and Persia.

One is forced to the unpleasant conclusion that there is less religious liberty in the world today than some decades ago. The startling facts are a challenge to the Church in those more favoured lands, where we can today take religious liberty for granted, to realize what is at stake and take measures accordingly. On the securing of religious liberty everywhere depend all those things which the Church exists to be and do. Without religious liberty she cannot evangelize and pursue her missionary task to the ends of the earth (it is of all things most natural that books on this subject should be written by missionaries). Without religious liberty, Christian internationalism and the œcumenical movement are doomed. Unless religious relationship can be freely maintained across frontiers, worldwide Christian co-operation and common action become impossible.

The price of religious liberty is eternal vigilance. The last chapter

"Plan for Liberty," is a strong plea for a Charter of Religious Liberty to be included in any international Bill of Rights which may be promoted by the United Nations or any other world-wide organization.

Religious liberty, *i.e.*, freedom for every man to hold a belief according to his conscience and to propagate that belief, is bound up with the whole cause of human freedom. The last thing Christians should seek is any special privilege of religious liberty for Christianity, or any one form of it. The Church, alas, has not an unblemished record in this respect.

The early chapters give an interesting and fresh account of the development of religious liberty through the centuries and the reaction of Christianity to that development.

GENEVA. RUTH ROUSE.

THE WAY OF SUFFERING: ESSAYS ON THE CHRISTIAN SIGNIFICANCE OF SUFFERING. By Leslie Kingsbury. Longmans. 6s.

It is usually implied that suffering is an evil thing in itself and is caused by evil. With the latter the author of the book agrees. It is common, too, to insist that suffering must be prevented and cured at all costs. But, as in all secular attempts to deal with an evil, this is to treat rather the symptoms of a disease than the disease itself, which can only be finally cured by destroying the cause.

Whereas medicine and surgery and social services do for the most part concentrate on relief rather than on prevention, it is now becoming more and more a normal part of both medicine and social services to try to remove the cause of distress. Leslie Kingsbury goes a step further in carrying the whole subject of suffering into the spiritual and moral sphere of wrongdoing by men.

His thesis is therefore that, since wrongdoing will always be with us in life in the world, so we shall always have suffering. This may seem to be fatalistic, but it is not this that the author intends to convey. He states that "the possibility of suffering is inherent in human nature itself, as it now is, rendered corrupt by the Fall," and that there is in man's nature a physical-spiritual tension which, as long as it lasts, must produce suffering.

A common disagreement between religious and non-religious people is the statement often made by the former that suffering is "the will of God." The author effectively deals with this when he agrees that the explanation that "God sends suffering" is intellectually untenable, because thereby either the goodness or the omnipotence of God would be overthrown. On the other hand, there cannot be the slightest doubt that our sanctification is the will of God, and it is to be supposed that, if our sanctification involves suffering, then suffering can in this sense be said to be the will of God. This is so, however, only as it is inherent in the tension between the perfect man as God planned him and the very imperfect man which man has made of himself.

The chapter "Reparation and Sanctification" clearly defines this tension and its resolution in the sufferings of Christ borne and conquered vicariously for us, as He not only shows the way but also

consummates the fullness of the stature of God's intention in a mystic fashion which gathers up the whole of mankind.

The chapter "Suffering and the Community" is rather involved, and is perhaps the least satisfactory. There is too much emphasis on an implied permission for suffering to be unrelieved, and it would have been good to read some amplification of the subject which the author calls "works of mercy" from this particular point of view.

Undoubtedly, the general reader coming to the book without previous thought or any theological training will find much that is unpalatable, since it is the unvarnished truth. The minister of religion and the instructed Christian will find much illumination.

The last chapter, "Suffering after Death," is, as far as we know, something that has not appeared before in any form. Its unique approach bears a message to those who make so much of death as a mere passage into perfect happiness, and is one of the best chapters on purgatory that we know.

This is, in our opinion, a specialist's book which deserves careful pondering; but it needs wise exposition to the general reader. It is necessarily, as the author hints in his preface, more easily approached by the mystic.

G. Kendal Dovey, O.G.S.

Prestfelde,
Shrewsbury.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales, Vol. 1 (*H.S.C.W. No.* 2). Edited by J. Conway Davies, 39 Cathedral Road, Cardiff. 10s., or (buckram binding) 14s. 6d. per annum to members.

Besides publishing with introductions the chief documentary sources for her history, the Historical Society of the Church in Wales provides in its *Journal* an organ for shorter and more popular studies. Not that this first number prostitutes scholarship to sensation. Its central piece is Prof. Hamilton Thompson's massive study of the Norman Conquest's effects on Welsh diocesan organization. Articles which will have an appeal beyond the Principality are those of Mr Glanmor Williams on Richard Davies, the Marian exile who became a distinguished Bishop of St Davids; of Mr Bethell on Henry Vaughan; and of the Rev. W. Moelwyn Merchant on Bishop Watson of Llandaff and his place in late eighteenth-century political thought. Our great ecclesiastics down the centuries appear, and the Bishop of Swansea and Brecon has immortalized a notorious one, Bogo de Clare. Other essays—for instance, Dr B. G. Charles' account of the family of George Owen, the historian of Pembrokeshire, and their behaviour over the tithes of Nevern—vividly illustrate how much detailed local research into Welsh Church history remains to be done. And may there be successors to the one Welsh essay, distinguished alike for learning and style, in which Canon Gwynfryn Richards discusses the old Welsh

custom of holding a service with carols early on Christmas Day, and traces "Y Plygain" back to its roots in the traditional Christmas Masses, and the Hour Offices.

E. O. T. Lewis.

Uzmaston,
Haverfordwest.

Eyes of Faith. By Paul S. Minear. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

Books by American theologians and books by existentialists and books about eschatology and history commonly demand of the English reader patience and application above the ordinary, and when all three of these characteristics are combined it is well indeed that we are warned at the outset to be "quite aware of the peculiar obstacles" that we must surmount; and when we reach Dr Minear's epilogue we may readily concur with his acknowledgment in the preface that "the deeper relevance of the Biblical tradition," which he has apprehended, he has been "quite unable to transfer to the written page."

Dr Minear's book suffers from an initial disadvantage that is probably not his fault, in that its pages are littered with Americanisms like "the King James Version," "behavior" and the irritating repetition of verbs like "stem from," and it is surely unfortunate in a book printed in England that well-known works of Bultmann and others are cited with the American publishers. But even if these superficial improvements had been remembered the style would still have needed simplification.

Dr Minear contrasts the points of view of men in the Bible and men of today. The only way of understanding the prophets and Jesus and Paul is by sharing their existential experience of listening to God and obeying Him. If we stand aside and analyse them, we are nothing more than neutral bystanders. Dr Minear seems to maintain a fairly sceptical attitude to historicity and to its importance—it is, for example, irrelevant to his purpose to separate the original from the secondary elements in the miracle narratives (p. 190). "Simple curiosity may weave fanciful tales of why . . . the carpenter's son was called Jesus" (p. 205). The Cross and Resurrection are considered as events within the historical series, but their importance seems to lie in the solution they afford to intellectual and moral problems by translating the Christian into a new mood of buoyant peace and joy (p. 267). The index of authors ranges from Marcion to Thomas Mann, but strangely omits Anders Nygren.

By reason of its subject and arrangement this book might have been welcomed by the growing body of priests who want to preach. As it is, the best service it renders is to confirm the validity of some of the warnings of Liberal scholars, like Hans Windisch, against interpreting the Bible in terms of Soren Kierkegaard.

Wilfrid Browning.

Hove.

To the Hebrews. A dogmatic and devotional Commentary. By Bede Frost. Mowbray. 6s. 6d.

The First Epistle of St Peter. By W. Wilson Cash. Church Book Room Press. 6s.

These two commentaries on Holy Scripture, coming from authors of sharply contrasted, if not opposite, schools of thought in the Church of England, reveal a remarkable unanimity on one fundamental principle: that the Bible is the best commentary on itself. Each, with its wealth of scriptural cross-references, is designed to encourage "the reading of the Bible biblically" in the Dominican phrase quoted by Bede Frost, and support the growing hope that, with the rediscovery of Holy Scripture, many divergent traditions may be seen to be relatively superficial. Both are written for the intelligent layman and subordinate critical questions of date and authorship to the primary Biblical purpose of interpreting God's ways to men. It is against this common background that their differences should be assessed.

Bede Frost's professedly "dogmatic" commentary is written from within the orthodox tradition of Western Catholicism, defined when necessary by the Biblical Commission. Prefaced by an introduction in which critical and background questions are briefly treated, and by a longer theological summary which, particularly on the central theme of sacrifice, is admirable, the book consists of a running commentary on the text, section by section, which is often illuminating, always sound and solidly impressive in its cumulative effect, though occasionally its assumptions strike oddly on an Anglican ear. As a "safe" introduction to the message of a difficult epistle this book is certainly to be recommended, but its strictly "dogmatic" treatment makes the other adjective "devotional" somewhat misleading.

The Bishop of Worcester has written a "study book" on the First Epistle of St Peter, based on Dean Selwyn's recent commentary, primarily to illustrate a simple method of Bible study which can be adapted to any other book of the Bible. It is the product of a mind acquainted with the devotional possibilities of a concordance and accustomed to prayerful use of Scripture with pencil in hand. It belongs to the spiritual freehold of all devout Christians, Catholic and Evangelical, and cannot fail to benefit any earnest reader.

St Katharine's College, Liverpool, 16. G. E. P. Cox.

The Grace of God and German Guilt. By Heinrich Vogel. Translated by W. A. Whitehouse. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

What is "The Problem of Germany"? The answer depends upon our point of view and the depth of our insight. These clear translations of three addresses by Dr Heinrich Vogel, Professor of Theology in Berlin University, provide an answer. They were delivered during 1945 and 1946, and express the endeavour of a Christian who is a German to understand and solve the problem. The burden of his message to his contemporaries, including a congregation of students

at the reopening of Berlin University, is that the problem is ultimately theological. There is no solution in a refusal to admit German guilt before God. But it is in this admission that one learns of the grace of God through which new life may come. "It is only in God's presence that we remain human, or indeed can become human with that humanity for which we have been created and redeemed" (p. 45). The responsibility for proclaiming this way of renewal rests primarily upon the Christian Church in Germany. But such preaching is never merely local. To preach the Gospel anywhere is to preach the Gospel to the world. This is a book for Christians of all countries. It reminds us that the classic instance of Christian reconstruction is the Incarnation.

G. F. W.

Butler of Wantage. His inheritance and his legacy. Dacre Press. 6s. 6d.

This book supplements *A Hundred Years of Blessing*, and those who enjoyed reading that account of the growth of the Community of St Mary the Virgin, Wantage, will find this a valuable addition. It is an offering of the Community to the memory of its Founder, William John Butler. It succeeds in giving us a portrait of a "great priest who in his days pleased God." Short though this study is, it is of rare quality. The portrait is drawn in relation to Butler as Vicar of Wantage, where he was appointed in 1847; a century later his work is seen in true perspective. Wantage could claim ancient association with Alfred the Great and two religious foundations prior to the fifteenth century. Joseph Butler, afterwards Bishop of Durham, was born there. But a century ago it was not an easy parish to take over; lethargy had fallen upon it, "and lethargy hates to be aroused." Yet Butler did arouse it, and here is the story of his achievement retold. Butler knew what the Church could give, what he himself wanted and his people needed. He organized, instructed, prayed and loved his people. A man of ardent, determined will, yet self-effacing and humble, he made of his inheritance a "very fruitful field." His pastoral zeal emerges out of these pages, his zeal for education—"the battle for the Church must be won in the schools"—and finally his faith and vision in the founding of the Sisterhood to be the handmaid of the Church. Here he owed much to the complete devotion of Mother Harriet, Superior of the Community for thirty-four years. How humble she was!

When Butler was buried in Lincoln Minster fifty years ago, he had bequeathed to the Church of England a legacy of great religious worth. This year, 1948, will witness centenary celebrations at Wantage. We see whereunto the Community has grown; St Mary's Convent, with its branch houses in this country and abroad, representative of the English tradition at its best and serving the Church by maintaining the life of prayer as its first care, and its active work expanded to the utmost limits. "Faith, grind and prayer will win all things" was one of Butler's aphorisms, and we are glad to be reminded of it.

This book is spiritually refreshing and will be profitably read in retreat.

CHESTER. C. E. JARMAN.

The Inside of the Cup. By Ferdinand Valentine, O P. Blackfriars Publications, Oxford. 6s.

There is a real need for a book of this kind today, and we may well be grateful to Fr Valentine for having written it. His Theophila and David are young people with a real desire for God, doing their best to live the Christian life in the world; and the counsel he gives them is forthright and practical, marked by a real spiritual insight and an understanding of modern society.

The major part of the book is concerned with advice on what the author calls the prayer of A.C.T.S.; which is a simple way of affective prayer based on acts of Adoration, Contrition, Thanksgiving and Supplication. This will be of great value not only to beginners but also to others who are "stuck" in their mental prayer and unable to meditate. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that Fr Valentine began his exposition of this way of prayer in a previous volume (*Whatsoever He Shall Say*), and so we miss the beginnings of his teaching; but it is easy to understand what he is talking about and his counsels on difficulties, dangers and distractions are excellent, as also his exposition of what he calls "the pause of attention." His writing is simple but never superficial.

The method of relaxation which he advocates merits close attention, not only as an antidote to temptations to impurity (for which purpose he advises it), but as a means to tranquillity of soul in an anxious and distractive age.

We commend this little book to the attention of parish priests, though, if they have many Theophilas and Davids in their congregations, we suspect it will not remain long on their bookshelves.

BAULKING. F. P. HARTON.

In the Day of Judgement: A play in two parts written in commemoration of the Quatercentenary of the English Litany. By Richard Hanson. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

With a vigorous dramatic touch the protagonists of the crisis of the English Reformation are set on the stage, first in 1544 in the Chapter House of St Paul's Cathedral when reform is in the air and truth is at stake, and secondly in 1556 in front of St Mary's, Oxford, where Cranmer pays the last penalty. By a few swift strokes Mr Hanson lays the scene and introduces the audience to the theological issues involved. He presents Gardiner in a rage, Bonner as cautious, often rather contemptible, but attractively frank, Hooper iconoclastic, and Cranmer complex. He happily avoids burlesque, and throughout the play the spectator senses the seriousness of the theme "*magna est veritas et prævalebit.*" Between the singing of the opening sentences of the English Litany as the prologue and the urgent closing petitions

"O Lamb of God . . . O Christ hear us" is worked out the tragic drama of a human life tortured by blindness of heart, envy, hatred, heresy, and schism. Cranmer's life amidst his fellow-churchmen expresses in terms of flesh and blood the spirit of the Litany. The play, which is cast for seven principal male actors, was first produced in 1944 at the Divinity Hostel, Dublin, by Lennox Robinson of the Abbey Theatre, and proved to be an acknowledged success.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

George Simms.

The New Testament in the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures. By Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. Sands. 10s. 6d.

This is a shorter version of a work published in parts between 1913 and 1935, and is, in the words of the preface, "largely intended for the devotional reading of the faithful." The translation is made from a Greek text which appears in the main to be similar to that underlying the Revised Version. The English rendering is on the whole clear and accurate, as well as readable, though it is somewhat awkwardly archaic in places. The arrangement of the book is rational and convenient; the text is printed in paragraphs, and divided into sections, with the traditional chapter and verse divisions indicated in the margins. The Pauline Epistles are arranged in the order which the author believes to be chronological; in the Catholic Epistles Jude follows 2 Peter and is followed by the three Epistles of John. Introductions are provided for the longer books and groups of the shorter (the Epistles of the Captivity, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Catholic Epistles). These state with a confidence and brevity approaching the oracular the traditional view of their authorship, and, though allusion is made to the existence of critical doubts, no attempt is made to explain or to counter them, except by the method of dogmatic assertion. Brief notes are also added.

For the purpose and persons for which these notes and comments are designed, they are no doubt admirably suited, and it would be foolish to complain that their author has not done what he did not intend to do. It is, however, fair to say that members of communions other than the author's must feel that the limitations imposed by the rulings of the Biblical Commission reduce the value of his work for them, and that the author is not wholly consistent in his critical judgments. Thus, on p. 349 he alludes to the omission of the words "in Ephesus" from Ephesians i, 1 "in our two best manuscripts," as supporting the theory of a "circular letter" of which he apparently approves. But when writing of Mark xvi, 9-20 he simply says, "These verses have not the same textual support as the rest of the gospel"—from which one would not gather that his "two best manuscripts" in fact omit them. But cases of this kind are few, and those who do not share the author's preconceptions can still find much to profit from in a study of his pages.

J. N. Sanders.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

Religion in the Twentieth Century. Edited by V. Ferm. Philosophical Library. New York. $5.00.

An American book, containing brief accounts (fourteen pages is the average length) of twenty-eight religions or branches of religions. The main varieties of Christianity dealt with are Anglo-Catholicism, Roman-Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Conservative Protestantism and Liberal Protestantism. Judaism and the main Eastern faiths are included; also various sects, the Church of the New Jerusalem, Sikhs, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc. Each is described by a well-qualified and sympathetic authority. The editor's preface expresses the hope that a world religion of the future may result from a synthesis of the good in all faiths, and implies that neither Christianity nor any other religion possesses a final revelation. But the editor's views have not coloured any of the contributed essays, and as a source of information the book should be found useful. One could hardly imagine better use made of fourteen pages than in the essay on Anglo-Catholicism by a member of the American Episcopal Church. F. H. Allen.

Dunton Bassett.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment*)

Allen and Unwin: Ashley Sampson (Ed.), *The Englishman's Religion* (7s. 6d.).

Blackfriars: George Kaftal, *St Dominic in Early Tuscan Painting* (7s. 6d.); Gerald Vann, O.P., *The Pain of Christ* (3s. 6d.); Drostan Maclaren, O.P., *Private Property and the Natural Law* (1s.); Vincent McNabb, O.P., *The Akathistos Hymn* (3s. 6d.).

Burns Oates: Dom P. C. Lou Tseng-Tsiang, *Ways of Confucius and of Christ* (10s. 6d.).

Christian Action (Oriel College, Oxford): *A Call to Action by Christians in the Present Crisis: Report of the Meeting at the Albert Hall on April 25, 1948* (1s., post free).

Dacre Press: E. G. Wood, *The Regal Power of the Church* (4s. 6d.).

East and West Library: F. Thesiger, *King Solomon* (12s. 6d.).

Hodder and Stoughton: P. A. Micklem, *The Secular and the Sacred* (10s. 6d.).

Jewish Fellowship: *The Journal of Jewish Studies* (a new quarterly review: 21s. per annum).

Longmans: R. J. Campbell, *The Life of the World to Come* (12s. 6d.); E. H. Burgmann, *The Church's Encounter with Civilization* (2s.); W. Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution* (15s.).

Mowbray: E. Cammaerts, *The Work of the Christian Cell* (1s. 6d.); C. P. S. Clarke, *The Roman Claims* (1s. 6d.); F. C. Eeles, *Notes on Episcopal Ornaments and Ceremonial* (3s. 6d.).

Oxford House: *The Oxford House in Bethnal Green, 1884-1948* (2s. 6d.).

Pickering and Inglis: Andrew Veitch, *Richard Cameron* (*The Lion of the Covenant*) (8s. 6d.).

Sands: J. M. Scott, *St Jane Frances de Chantal* (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: Bishop of Swansea and Brecon, *The Church in Wales* (Reprint from Theology) (6d.); C. Zvegintzov, *Our Mother Church: Her Worship and Offices* (compiled from standard Russian text-books) (3s. 6d.); E. R. Morgan and R. Lloyd (Ed.), *The Mission of the Anglican Communion* (10s. 6d.).

Tyndale Press: W. Hendriksen, *More than Conquerors: an Interpretation of the Book of Revelation* (n.p.)

Verlag Herder (Wien): J. Standinger, S.J., *Das Schone als Weltanschauung* (S.25, Austrian).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher